

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 6, 2006. Claims 35, 37, 39 and 41 to 46 remain in the application. Claims 35, 37 and 39 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 35, 37, 39 and 41 to 46 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome substantive rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In this regard, Claims 35, 37, 39 and 41 to 46 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. With regard to Claim 39, the Office Action included suggested language for the preamble and Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggested language. Accordingly, this basis for the § 112 rejection of Claim 39 is believed to be overcome.

The Office Action also requested clarification of the term "second location information in a second hierarchy superior to the first hierarchy which information is made correspondent to the map." Specifically, the Office Action contended that the term "superior to" is unclear in light of the remarks provided in Applicants' prior response. It is noted that in the remarks included in the previous response, it was pointed out that the first hierarchy could be seen to correspond to the floor of a building, while the second hierarchy could be seen to correspond to a room on the floor. This assertion was erroneous and the Office Action has correctly pointed out that in this case, the second hierarchy would not be "superior to" the first hierarchy. The assertion in Applicants' previous response was merely transposed and should have pointed out that the first hierarchy location can be seen

to correspond to the room on the floor, while the second hierarchy location, which is superior to the first hierarchy location, can be seen to correspond to the floor of the building. While Applicants' remarks may have been erroneous, the claims are nonetheless clear.

The Office Action also questioned the meaning of "which information is made correspondent to the map." The claims have been amended to make it clearer that the second information is registered into the map.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Attorney for Applicants

Edward A.Kmett

Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, New York 10112-2200

Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 125580v1